13th August 1954]

raised. We are advised by our legal advisers that there are decisions of Labour Appellate Tribunals that suspension of workers during the pendency of appeal will not amount to punishment and there are decisions to the contrary also. Since the question is coming up before the Labour Tribunal for decision in the present case itself, we shall await the decision of the Tribunal.''

SRI S. RAMALINGAM :—'' சஸ்பென்ஷனில் இருப்பது பனிஷ்மெண்ட் ஆகாது என்று கனம மந்திரி அவர்கள சொன்னார். அப்பெல்லட் ட்ரிபுனல் தீர்ப்புகள் அப்படி இருப்பதாக லீகல் அட்வைசர் மந்திரிககுச சொன்னதாகச் சொன்னார். நான் கேட்க விரும்புவது என்னவென்றால், அவர்களுககு சஸ்டென்ஷன் காலத்தில் சம்பளம் கொடுக்கப்படுகிறதா, அதுமட்டுமல்ல, அவர்களுடைய ஸ்டேடஸ் மாறாமல் இருக்கிறதா அந்த சஸ்பென்ஷன் காலத்தில், என்பதைக் கேட்க விரும்புகிறேன்.''

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM :—'' I am unable to answer the question put by the hon. Member. I have only pointed out that there are contrary decisions regarding the position about suspension of workers during the pendency of an appeal.''

SRI M. KALYANASUNDRAM :—'' கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, இந்தக் கம்பெனியானது, அதாவது ஸ்டாண்டர்ட் வாகுவம் ஆயில் கம்பெனி ஒரு அமெரிக்க அன்னிய நாட்டுக் கம்பெனி. அது இந்த நாட்டின் மக்களுடைய நலலெண்ணத்தையும், மதப்பையும் பெறக்கூடியது. மத்திய சர்க்கார் மே தினத்தை விடுமுறையாகக் கருதவேண்டும் என்று ஒப்புக் கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். அதையே பிரதம மந்திரியும் அடிக்கடி சொல்லிக் கொண்டு வருகிறார். மே தினத்தை விடுமுறையாகக் கொண்டாடுவது குற்றம் என்று அந்தக் கம்பெனி கருதுகிறதா? அப்படி இருந்தால் அந்தக் கம்பெனி மீது என்ன நடவடிக்கை எடுக்க சர்க்கார் முடிவு செய்திருக்கிறது?''

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM :—'' That question does not at all arise before the Government. The Government have to see what action they can take under the existing law and we are advised that we must await the decision of the Appellate Tribunal.''

(Question No. 1326-F appears on page 76.)

Separation of Judiciary from the Executive in Malabar.

* 126 [a] *Q.*—SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP : Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether details regarding the separation of the judiciary from the Executive in the district of Malabar have been finalised; and

(*b*) if so, what they are?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—'' (*a*) Certain decisions were reached in 1949 and they are being examined further.

'' (*b*) The decisions reached in 1949 are as follows :—

On the revenue side one of the five existing revenue divisions, viz., Kozhikode, and four of the nine Deputy Tahsildars'

[a] Postponed from the list for 11th August 1954.

charges, viz., Tirurangudi, Kunnamangalam, Kuttuparamba and Vayittiri will be abolished. The revenue divisions will be reconstituted as shown below :—

Divisions.		
Headquarters.		Taluks.
Tellicherry	..	Chirakkal, Kottayam, Wynaad and Kurumbranad.
Palghat	..	Ponnani and Palghat.
Cochin	..	Cochin.
Malappuram	..	Walluvanad, Ernad and Kozhikode.

On the magisterial side.—The district will be divided into four magisterial subdivisions, viz., (1) Cannanore, (2) Kozhikode, (3) Malappuram and (4) Palghat. The statement below shows the jurisdiction of the District Magistrates, Subdivisional Magistrates and Sub-Magistrates :—

	Magistrates.	Headquarters.	Jurisdiction (taluks).
1	District Magistrate.	Cannanore.	Chirakkal and Kottayam taluks excluding the limits of Police station at Panur.
2	Subdivisional Magistrate.	Kozhikode.	Kozhikode, Kurumbranad, Wynaad and limits of police station at Panur in Kottayam taluk.
3	Subdivisional Magistrate.	Malappuram.	Walluvanad and Ernad.
4	Do.	Palghat.	Palghat and Ponnani.

Second-class Magistrates.

1	Second-class Magistrate.	Cannanore	Chirakkal.
2	Do.	Badagara.	Kurumbranad.
3	Do.	Kuttuparamba.	Kottayam.
4	Do.	Vayittiri	Wynaad.
5	Do.	Kozhikode.	Kozhikode.
6	Do.	Manjeri.	Ernad (excluding Tirurangudi sub-taluk).
7	Do.	Perintalmanna.	Walluvanad (excluding Ottapalam sub-taluk).
8	Do.	Ponnani	Ponnani taluk (excluding Tirur sub-taluk).
9	Do.	Palghat I	Palghat taluk (excluding Alathur sub-taluk).

TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS

13th August 1954]

	Magistrate.	Headquarters.	Jurisdiction. (taluk).
	Second class Magistrates—cont.		
10	Second-class Magistrate.	Palghat II.	Alathur sub-taluk and Ottapalam sub taluk.
11	Do.	Tirurangudi.	Tirurangudi sub-taluk and Tirur sub-taluk.

(Existing arrangements in Cochin for transaction of civil and criminal judicial work will be continued under the new set up.)"

SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP :—" With regard to the location of these courts and prescribing jurisdiction for them, may I know whether the Government will watch the working of the scheme and make necessary revisionary proposals as and when found necessary? "

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Since separation, Magistrates with only judicial functions have been appointed and, therefore, there has been a lessening in the number of courts. So jurisdiction of the court had to be re-arranged. In that, I am prepared to admit there might be some grievance here and there and some hardship might have been created. But, let us see for a while how this works and, if necessary, the whole matter will be gone into and necessary revisions and reorganizations may be made."

SRI T. C. NARAYANAN NAMBIAR :—" Will the Hon. Minister be good enough to state whether he has received representations from the sub-tauk of Taliparamba in Chirakkal taluk that as the Second-class Magistrate's Court, Cannanore, is situated at about 20 to 25 miles' distance from certain areas of their place, they are put to great difficulty and that the Government may be pleased to locate it at Taliparamba, and if this is not possible, at least to hold the sitting of the court in that place for three days in a week?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" I have received numerous representations from all centres. If every representation is to be looked into, we should have 10 to 15 courts more. Unfortunately, it is not possible to do it. That is why I said, ' Let us see how the present arrangement works and if necessary revision can be made later on '."

Taxation Enquiry Commission.

* 1327 Q.—SRI A. RATNAM : Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state— 10-20 a.m.

(*a*) whether the Government have advised the Hon. Members of the Legislative Assembly and Council to give evidence before the Taxation Enquiry Commission which met at Madras in April 1954; and